

Attorney Docket No. USA.353  
U.S. Serial No. 10-644,299  
Page 9 of 11

### **REMARKS**

In the present Office Action, claims 1-42 were examined. Claims 1-21 or 22-42 are subject to restriction or election. Claims 22-42 are withdrawn. Claims 1-21 were elected with traverse to be prosecuted. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 3 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are presented for further examination. No new matter has been added. By this Amendment, claims 1-21 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The provisional election of Group I, claims 1-21, made by the undersigned attorney for the Applicants on October 4, 2005 is hereby affirmed. It is recognized that the Group II claims 22-42, are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner.

#### **Rejections/Objections under 35 USC §112**

The Examiner rejected claim 1-21 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for two reasons. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to overcome those objections raised by the Examiner. Claim 2 was objected to because of missing punctuation. The objection to claim 2 has been redressed by the insertion of the period punctuation mark.

#### **Rejections under 35 USC §102**

1) The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Haruta et al. (EP 0830928 B1) and Watanabe et al. (EP 0831373 B2). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

Both of these two references do not teach the inclusion of nanometer sized silicon-type particles as currently claimed. Note paragraph 62 of Haruta et al. and page 7, line 42 of Watanabe et al. Both teach the average particle size of their silica fillers are "1 to 50" microns which is larger than a nanometer size particle and much larger than the 10 to 50 nanometer particles claimed in claim 11.

Attorney Docket No. USA.353  
U.S. Serial No. 10-644,299  
Page 10 of 11

2) The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Napadenskey et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0207959 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

This reference does not teach or suggest the stereolithography process steps as presently claimed. Note that the disclosed process requires selective dispensing of two interface materials with ink-jet printers (see paragraphs 13, 14, 73 and 207). This disclosed method is not a stereolithographic process.

It is appreciated that the Examiner stated in this anticipation rejection that this reference also teaches "stereolithography as a process for making a three-dimensional object." However, such a teaching is not seen. The Examiner is respectfully requested to point out the specific passages which teach the currently claimed sequence of steps. In the absence of such a teaching, this anticipatory rejection must be withdrawn.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections are respectfully requested.

#### Rejection under 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejected claim 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable in view of over Napadenskey et al. Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

In making this obviousness rejection, the Examiner states "The claimed process would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of Napadenskey et al. principally because Napadenskey et al. also teaches stereography as a process for making a three-dimensional object." Again, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide the specific passages to show that the invention of these inventors may be modified to be used in the presently claimed stereolithographic process. In the absence of such a teaching, this obviousness rejection must be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No. USA.353  
U.S. Serial No. 10-644,299  
Page 11 of 11

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the references, alone or in combination, anticipate or make obvious the invention as presently claimed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the application and the Examiner is respectfully requested to take such proper actions so that a patent will issue herefrom as soon as possible.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes that a discussion with Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Please apply any credits or charge any deficiencies to our Deposit Account No. 20-0900.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bettina Steinmann, et al.

Date:

December 28, 2005



Ralph D'Alessandro  
Attorney For Applicants  
Reg. No. 28,838

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

Ralph D'Alessandro  
3D Systems Corp.  
26081 Avenue Hall  
Valencia, CA 91355  
661-295-5600 X2404